



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

40

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,512	11/26/2003	Sumitake Kobayashi	1734.1001CIP	6099
21171	7590	08/03/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			REID, CHERYL M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/721,512

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Cheryl M. Reid

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-24 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 14-24 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 14-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. ***Claims 14, 15-20, 21, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori (US 6084685) hereinafter Mori and Leong et al (US 6687018) hereinafter Leong, and further in view of Kashiwagi et al (US 5377016) hereinafter Kashiwagi.***

4. In regards to claims 14 and 21, Mori teaches of :
 - a plurality of request processing units that process request received from at least one of the multifunction machines (Col 2 lines 30-40, Col 3 lines 60-65, Col 4 lines 1-5);
 - an assigning unit that assigns the request processing unit to the multifunction based on the request (Col 5, lines 44-54) wherein the assigning unit is the

computer (50) because it decides which unit will receive the data based on the type of processing that is required;

- Mori does not explicitly teach of the completion-of-assignment notification indicating that processing of the request is possible and an information recorder that has multifunction connection information, the multifunction connection information indicative of whether the multifunction machine is in an operable state in linkage with the server, wherein the request is received based on the multifunction connection information. In an analogous art, Leong teaches on these aspects. Leong teaches of the completion-of notification.....(Col 6, lines 50-60) and an information recorder that(Col 7, lines 65-67, Col 8, lines 1-15) wherein the information recorder is the output device and the operable state is that the printer is idle (i.e. available to receive and print a job). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Leong into Mori's invention because both invention relates to the facilitation of image processing or image generation. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated because it would eliminate the need for a user to know the status and attributes of every printer as reasons discussed by Leong (Col 1, lines 40-60, Col 2, lines 1-5).
- In regards to the remaining limitations of claims 14 and 21, neither Mori nor Leong explicitly teach on those aspects. Mori teaches of using a predetermined time mechanism (Fig 7, Col 12, lines 35-45). In an analogous art, Kashiwagi teaches of using cancellation means (Col 6, lines 25-45). Mori's invention relates

Art Unit: 2142

to providing an efficient multifunction processing system (Col 1, lines 15-25).

Kashiwagi's invention relates to a multifunction image processing system (Col 1, lines 5-15). Modifying Mori's invention so that a cancellation is done if data is not received in a predetermined time would result in a more efficient system because it would allow the system to efficiently allocate and use its resources. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to make the above-mentioned modifications.

5. In regards to claim 15, Leong teaches of the completion-of –assignment notification.....(Col 6, lines 50-60).
6. In regards to claim 16, Mori teaches of fax that faxes an image data (Col 3, lines 65-67), and wherein the request.....fax and sends the image data....(Col 4, lines 1-10).
7. In regards to claim 17, Mori teaches of a recorder that records image data wherein the request processing unit records the image data.....(Col 5, lines 39-48).
8. In regards to claim 18, Mori teaches of utilizing situation recorder that records.....the utilizing situation information back to said node having transmitted a transmission request (Col 5, lines 55-60).
9. In regards to claim 19, Mori teaches of wherein the utilizing situation.... (Col 5, lines 55-60) and in accordance with a predetermined schedule (Col 12, lines 33-45).
10. In regards to claim 20, Mori does not explicitly teach of : a destruction detecting unit that detects a destruction....Kashiwagi teaches on these aspects (Col 6, lines 40-45). Refer to claim 14 for motivation.

Art Unit: 2142

11. In regard to claim 23, Mori does not explicitly teach of this limitation. Leong teaches of wherein the server has information of each of the multifunction machine and the information has the status of the multifunction machine (Col 6, lines 44-60, Col 8, lines 1-15).

12. In regards to claim 24, Mori teaches of refer to the discussion of claim 14. In regards to the limitation : wherein the server has at least one of option information....Leon teaches of wherein the server has at least one of option information, the option information is information of a function executable by the multifunction machine (Col 6, lines 59-65, Col 8, lines 3-11). Refer to claim 14 for motivation.

13. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori , and further in view of Matusmoto et al (US 20010038632) hereinafter Matusmoto

14. In regards to claims 22 Mori teaches of assigning a processing request to a usable multifunction apparatuses based on operation content of the request (Col 5, lines 44-54) and executing a function via the usable multifunction apparatus in accordance with the assigned request (Col 7, lines 1-15). Mori does not explicitly teach of transmitting a notification indicative of the assignment to the usable multifunction apparatus. In an analogous art, Matusmoto teaches on this aspect (Abstract, Fig 4,). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to

Art Unit: 2142

incorporate the teachings of Matusmoto into Mori because both inventions relates to the facilitation of image processing or image generation. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated because it would improve communication efficiency which is desirable as discussed by Matusmoto (Paragraph [0006, lines 9-14, Paragraph [0008])).

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2142

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M. Reid whose telephone number is 571 272 3903. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri (7-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmr

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER